



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,893	01/28/2005	Pauli Koutonen	FORSAL-99	7248
36528	7590	01/14/2008		
STIENNON & STIENNON 612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201 P.O. BOX 1667 MADISON, WI 53701-1667			EXAMINER KIM, SANG K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3654	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,893

Applicant(s)

KOUTONEN ET AL.

Examiner

SANG KIM

Art Unit

3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE 11/30/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/30/07 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 8-15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 8:

Line 12, "board wed" should be --board web--;

Line 14, "a second wrap function" should be --a second wrap angle function--.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Breacker et al., U.S. Patent No. 3430880.

Regarding claim 20, Breacker '880 discloses a paper wound into a web roll 10 through a winding nip (no reference number assigned) between the web roll 10 and a winding drum (11, 12), the web defining a wrap angle (no reference number assigned, by adjusting the roller 19, which causes the angle to change) as it passes through the nip, the wrap angle being the amount the web wraps the winding drum before entering the nip when the wrap angle is positive or negative (note, the wrap angle is relative to depending on which point of origin is measured from) and the structure of the web roll 10 being formed by adjusting the wrap angle (by adjusting the roller 19) of the web as it passes through the nip during the course of winding the web roll to obtain a desired roll hardness distribution (i.e., a predetermined hardness is already present in every wound web roll).

Regarding claims 22-23, as stated above Breacker '880 discloses changing the wrap angle, which inherently changes the roll hardness distribution of the roll by making the wrap angle smaller or bigger.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al., U.S. Patent No. 4199117.

Regarding claim 20, Muller '117 discloses applicant's claimed invention, as shown in figures 1-4. A system for winding a web into a web roll 6 by leading the web through a winding nip (no reference number assigned) defined between said web roll and a winding drum 6, the web defining a first wrap angle (α) as the web passes through the nip, the wrap angle being the amount the web wraps the winding drum before entering the nip when the wrap angle is positive or negative (note, the wrap angle is relative to depending on which point of origin is measured from), and the structure of the web roll 6 being formed by adjusting the wrap angle (α) of the web as it passes through the nip during the course of winding the web roll to obtain a desired roll hardness distribution (i.e., a predetermined hardness is already present in every wound web roll).

Winding a fibrous web such as a paper or board web is notoriously old and well known for operating and manufacturing apparatus of all kinds, including winders. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a specific type of web into the web roll.

Regarding claims 22-23, as stated above, Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle, which inherently changes the roll hardness distribution of the roll by making the wrap angle smaller or bigger.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al., U.S. Patent No. 4199117, in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent No. 4463586.

As stated above, Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle and regulated by moving the position of at least one guide roll (3, 4), since the web is wound between the rolls, it prevents slippage of the web, see column 1, lines 30-35.

Muller '117 discloses changing the wrap angle in a slitter machine but does not explain explicitly how the wrap angle is controlled.

Griffin discloses the concept of using a closed loop system which controls the wrap angle, see abstract.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Muller '117 with a closed loop system for controlling the wrap angle taught by Griffin, in order to accurately adjust the wrap angle.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breacker et al., U.S. Patent No. 3430880, in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent No. 4463586.

As stated above, Breacker '880 discloses changing the wrap angle and regulated by moving the position of the roller 19 and adjust the tension but does not explain explicitly how the wrap angle is controlled.

Griffin discloses the concept of using a closed loop system which controls the wrap angle, see abstract.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Breacker '880 with a closed loop system

for controlling the wrap angle taught by Griffin, in order to accurately adjust the wrap angle.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-19 are allowed.

Claims 8-15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection(s), set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

Claims 8-10, 13-14 and 16-18 have been amended.

Claims 20-23 have been added.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANG KIM whose telephone number is 571-272-6947. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Cuomo, can be reached on (571) 272-6856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/517,893
Art Unit: 3654

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SK

1/8/08

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Sang" followed by a stylized mark.